DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 162 EA 019 921

AUTHOR Pink, William T.
TITLE Effective Schools Pilot Project: Phase II.
INSTITUTION Kansas City School District, Mo.
PUB DATE Nov 85
NOTE 70p.; Some pages are printed on light green paper.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Attitude Measures; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Education; *Outcomes of Education; Program Effectiveness; *School Effectiveness; Standardized Tests
IDENTIFIERS *Effective Schools Pilot Project; Iowa Tests of Basic Skills

ABSTRACT

The Effective Schools Pilot Project, conceived in fall 1983, was designed to improve selected schools by focusing resources to assist six elementary schools in developing strategies for self-assessment and renewal through participatory decision-making. Phase I of the project (1983-1984) resulted in a set of research-based school improvement plans supported by a majority of the faculty at each school. This report evaluates Phase II (1984-85) of this multiyear project, assessing the effects that the project has had on student achievement, the perceptions of the various actors regarding content and implementation, and the overall success of the schools in implementing their improvement plans. Accordingly, three different kinds of data were collected for comparative analysis between project and control schools: (1) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) data for reading, mathematics, and language arts; (2) data from a standardized instrument, Describing Your School's Characteristics (DYSC) to measure the perception of staff and principals regarding their school's progress toward their set goals; and (3) extensive questionnaire data from staff and principals concerning their perceptions of the project itself. Findings suggest that project schools have made a promising start toward improving student achievement, but that several areas still require immediate attention: leadership, governance, management, facilitation, monitoring and data collection, staff development, academic and organizational climate, and parental involvement. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PILOT PROJECT:

PHASE II

William T. Pink

Program Evaluator

The School District of Kansas City, Missouri

Department of Planning, Research, Evaluation and Testing

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Effective Schools Pilot Project was conceptualized in the late Summer and early Fall of 1983. Grounded in the recent literature on effective schools, classroom instruction, staff development and school change, the project was designed to improve selected schools by focusing resources to assist schools develop strategies for self assessment and renewal. The school was seen as the unit for change, while participatory and "bottom-up" decision making was seen as the primary strategy to mobilize change.

In the school year 1983-84 six elementary schools (Bancroft, Faxon, Holmes, Pershing, Troost and Woodland) voted to join the project. Building leaders and teachers were engaged in a variety of staff development activities designed to (a) inform them about the content of the effective schools and school improvement literature, and to (b) engage them in planning for school improvement. This activity culminated in a Spring 1984 Retreat where diverse resources were focused to assist the six elementary schools write their 1984-85 school improvement plans. Thus, the major product of Phase I of the project was a set of school improvement plans that reflected the "best practice" found in the literature and enjoyed the support of the majority of the faculty at each school.

The school year 1984-85 is Phase II of what was conceived of as a multi-year project. It represents the first year in which the six schools in the project attempted to implement the activities they designed for the purpose of improving their schools. There are three evaluation questions to be addressed in this report. First, what impact does being a project school have on student achievement? Second, what are the perceptions of the various actors in the project regarding the content and the implementation of the project? Third, how successful were the schools in implementing activities contained in their school improvement plans?

Evaluation Procedures

Three different kinds of data are presented in this evaluation. First, Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) data for reading, mathematics and language arts are submitted to an analysis of covariance. This analysis is important because it allows us to statistically adjust the Spring 1985 scores and analyze the difference between the Spring 1985 scores of the project and control schools, assuming they scored the same prior to the 1984-85 school year.

Second, data were collected using a standardized instrument (Describing Your School's Characteristics: DYSC) that is designed to measure the perception of project and control school teachers, instructional assistants and principals concerning the degree to which their school has operationalized elements identified in the literature as distinguishing effective from less than effective schools.

Third, extensive questionnaire data were gathered from teachers, instructional assistants and principals concerning their perceptions about the project, including its effectiveness and ways that it might be improved.

These three sources of data will be used to evaluate the effective schools project. Where appropriate, comparisons will be made with the five control schools (Askew, Garfield, Ladd, Meservey and Willard) selected in September 1983 because they are similar to project schools in important ways (e.g., K-6 schools, Chapter 1 schools with low achievement profiles).

Findings

Several different data sources provide a range of evaluation data. First, a covariate analysis was conducted on the Spring 1985 ITBS reading, mathematics and language arts scores using the spring 1984 scores as the covariate. We found that nine of eighteen grade-level comparisons were statistically different. Seven of the significant differences favored the project schools, while only two favored the control schools.

Second, analysis of teacher, IA and principal responses to the perceptual instrument "Describing Your School's Characteristics" (DYSC) revealed some interesting patterns: the DYSC measures the degree to which school personnel perceive their school engaging in practices identified in the literature as defining an effective school. The respective mean scores of teachers, IA's and principals in project and control schools were almost identical. In each case, teachers had the highest mean score, followed by principals and trailed by IA's. While there was some variation in the perceptions of teachers in project schools across the nine components of the DYSC, these data suggest that teachers in both project and control schools perceive little difference in the degree to which their schools model the characteristics of effective schools.

Third, analysis of questionnaire data from teachers indicated that the majority of teachers (a) value and understand the project, and expect that it will continue to improve their school, (b) feel a part of the project, and perceive they have a greater involvement in decision making because they are a project school, (c) support the staff development activities, (d) question the implementation of the math intervention, (e) see the building leadership as effective, and (f) want the project to continue into the 1985-86 school year. They also indicate a number of areas where improvements are needed to make the project more effective.

Fourth, questionnaire data from IA's and principals revealed similar high levels of support for the project. The majority of building leaders (a) see the project as important for school improvement and understand the six project components, (b) see all three groups in their school as excited about being in the project, (c) rate teachers and building leaders somewhat differently in their knowledge of and commitment to the project, (d) support the staff development provided to shape the school improvement plan, (e) support the

mathematics interventions, (f) see site-base data as important for school improvement, (g) see themselves as able to provide leadership for school improvement, and (h) want the project to continue into the 1985-86 school year. IA's and principals also indicate a number of areas where improvements are needed to make the project more effective.

Implications of the Evaluation

This evaluation of Phase II of the effective schools project has indicated that while the project schools have made a promising start to improving student achievement by making a strong effort to operationalize and implement the "best practice" from the school effectiveness and school changes literatures, there are several areas that require immediate attention. A failure to address these issues may well limit the ability of project schools to become even more effective. These key areas are detailed in the evaluation and include: (a) leadership, (b) governance, (c) management, (d) facilitation, (e) monitoring and data collection, (f) staff development, (g) academic and organizational climate, and (h) parental involvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ii

A. Introduction 1

B. Evaluation Procedures 4

C. Student Achievement in Reading Mathematics and Language Arts 5

D. Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses to a Questionnaire Entitled "Describing Your School's Characteristics" (DYSC) 9

E. Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Perceptions About the Project 12

F. Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Views About Improving the Project 28

G. Concluding Comments 32

Appendix A: Profile of Project Schools, 1984-85 38

Appendix B: Covariance Summaries for Reading, Mathematics and Language Arts Spring 1985 ITBS Scores by Grade Level 40

Appendix C: Questionnaire Entitled "Describing Your School's Characteristics" (DYSC) 44

Appendix D: Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Comments Concerning Staff Development Needed by Project Teachers 49

Appendix E: Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Comments Concerning Ways to Improve the Project 53

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
1.	Reading Comprehension: Summary Data on ITBS Grade Equivalent Scores for Students Attending Effective and Control Schools	6
2.	Mathematics: Summary Data on ITBS Grade Equivalent Scores for Students Attending Effective and Control Schools	7
3.	Language Arts: Summary Data on ITBS Grade Equivalent Scores for Students Attending Effective and Control Schools	8
4.	Summary of Data from the Questionnaire Entitled "Describing Your School's Characteristics"	11
5.	Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses to Questions About the Effective Schools Concept	14
6.	Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses to Questions About Knowledge of the Effective Schools Project	15
7.	Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses to Questions About Organizational Change	17
8.	Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses to Questions About Staff Development	19
9.	Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses to Questions About Instructional Practices	20
10.	Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses to Questions About Instructional Improvement	23
11.	Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses to Questions About the Effectiveness of the Project	25
12.	Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses to Questions About the Effectiveness of Their School in Teaching Basic Skills	27

EVALUATION OF PHASE II's OF THE

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PILOT PROJECT

A. Introduction

The Effective Schools Pilot Project was conceptualized in the late Summer and early Fall of 1983.[1] Grounded in the recent literature on effective schools, classroom instruction, staff development and school change, the project was designed to improve selected schools by focusing resources to assist schools develop strategies for self assessment and renewal. The school was seen as the unit for change, while participatory and "bottom-up" decision making was seen as the primary strategy to mobilize change.

In September, 1983 five elementary schools (Bancroft, Faxon, Holmes, Pershing and Troost: Woodland was added about one month later) voted to join the project and activities were begun to realize the following four goals of the project for Phase I:

1. To increase participants' knowledge of effective schools characteristics and practices, and the research upon which they are based.

2. To develop participants' skills so they can examine their classrooms and buildings in relation to effective schooling characteristics.

3. To develop strategies consistent with research findings that will help participants implement and practice effective school activities.

4. To develop a participant's capacity to continually monitor and assess the effect of effective school intervention and practices.

These goals reflected the belief of the District Steering Committee that the first year of the project (Phase I) be used to inform the major actors

---

1 See the 1984 evaluation report for details of Phase I of the project: Pink, W.T. (1984), Effective Schools Pilot Project, Kansas City Missouri Public Schools, Department of Planning, Research, Evaluation and Testing.

about the substance of the effective schools literature and the problems likely to be encountered when engaging in school change. A variety of staff development activities were provided throughout the year for principals, instructional assistants and teachers. This activity culminated in a Spring 1984 Retreat where diverse resources were focused to assist the six elementary schools write their 1984-85 school improvement plans.

The Retreat provided an extended opportunity for all teachers in the six schools to work cooperatively with their building leaders to shape their school improvement plans. The charge was to incorporate each of the six components of the project into the plan, i.e., curriculum alignment, instruction, leadership, expectations, school climate and parent involvement. Thus, the major product of Phase I of the project was a set of school improvement plans that (a) reflected the "best practice" found in the school improvement and change literature, and (b) enjoyed the support of the majority of the faculty at each school.

The school year 1984-85 is Phase II of what was conceived of as a multi-year project. It represents the first year in which the six schools in the project attempted to implement the activities they designed for the purpose of improving their schools. Profile data of each school in the project for the years 1983-84 and 1984-85 show that the schools have remained relatively stable over the two-year period with respect to factors such as size, student enrollment and attendance, and student and teacher characteristics (see Appendix A). Thus, we can argue that outcomes are likely to be a function of the program rather than a function of changes in the demographics of the school.

Four events occurred during the 1984-85 school year that are unique to the six schools in the effective schools project:

(1) A two-day retreat (October 26 and 27) was held for the staff of project schools. The agenda covered three major topics. First, a review of Phase I of the project and a discussion of implementation strategies for the 1984-85 site plans. Second, an elaboration of the district's plans for curriculum alignment, including a presentation of revised reading objectives and their alignment with the basal series. Third, a discussion of two mathematics programs (Missouri Math and Team-Assisted Instruction) for possible field testing.

(2) Two separate interventions were mounted in project schools. First, in mathematics, both the Missouri Math (MMP) and Team-Assisted Instruction (TAI) were introduced to volunteering schools during October and November (Pershing used MMP; Bancroft, Holmes and Woodland used TAI; Troost was a control school; Faxon declined to participate). Schools implemented these programs throughout the remainder of the school year. Second, in reading, all project schools participated in a field test of a revised reading curriculum that aligned the basal text with the end of magazine level tests. The Houghton Mifflin ANSWER Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) system was used to facilitate this field test. Training in marking teacher manuals was provided during March and April and the field test was conducted during April and May.

(3) A coordinator for special projects was hired in January to manage the day-to-day operations of the effective schools project. In early February a reading resource teacher was added to the project staff and given the primary responsibility of working directly with the instructional assistants to facilitate the improvement of classroom instruction in reading: this person also assumed the major responsibility for coordinating the field test in reading.

(4) The Board approved additional funding for the project in late February. Four items were funded:

   (a) a stipend of $4,000.00 to each school for additional instructional materials,
   (b) monies to hire a full-time library aide,
   (c) monies to support expansion of the ANSWER system for the reading field test, and
   (d) monies for school personnel to visit other effective schools projects.

There are three questions to be addressed in this evaluation of the 1984-85 effective schools project. First, what impact does being a project school have

on student achievement? Second, what are the perceptions of the various actors in the project regarding the content and the implementation of the project? Third, how successful were the schools in implementing activities contained in their school improvement plans?

B. Evaluation Procedures

Three different kinds of data are presented in this evaluation. First, Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) data for reading, mathematics and language arts were submitted to an analysis of covariance. This analysis is important because it allows us to statistically adjust the Spring 1985 scores and analyze the difference between the Spring 1985 scores of the project and control schools, assuming they scored the same prior to the 1984-85 school year.

Second, data were collected using a standardized instrument (Describing Your School's Characteristics: DYSC) that is designed to measure the perception of project and control school teachers, instructional assistants and principals concerning the degree to which their school has operationalized elements identified in the literature as distinguishing effective from less than effective schools.

Third, extensive questionnaire data were gathered from teachers, instructional assistants and principals concerning their perceptions about the project, including its effectiveness and ways that it might be improved.

These three sources of data will be used to evaluate the effective schools project. Where appropriate, comparisons will be made with the five control schools (Askew, Garfield, Ladd, Meservey and Willard) selected in September 1983 because they are similar to project schools in important ways (e.g., K-6 schools, Chapter 1 schools with low achievement profiles). Each set of data will be analyzed separately in the following sections.

C. Student Achievement in Reading, Mathematics and Language Arts

To answer the question concerning the impact of the effective schools program, a covariate analysis was performed on the Spring 1985 ITBS reading, mathematics and language arts scores using the Spring 1984 scores as the covariate. This analysis makes a statistical adjustment of the Spring 1985 scores for possible differences between scores prior to the beginning of the 1984-85 school year. In short, this analysis enables us to determine, previous test scores being equal, whether a student attending a school in the effective schools project would do better than a student attending a control school.

Tables 1 through 3 contain the unadjusted and adjusted Spring 1985 means for reading, mathematics and language arts for each grde level (see Appendix B, Tables A through C for the covariance summary tables). Both the effective schools and control schools means are shown: an asterisk indicates which means are statistically different at the 95% level of probability (.05 level). Examination of the data in Tables 1 through 3 indicates the following:

(a) In reading (see Table 1),means are statistically different in two of the six grades. Students in effective schools do significantly better than students in control schools in the first grade, while students in control schools do significantly better than students in effective schools in the third grade. In the remaining four grades, i.e., two, four, five and six, the differences between the means are not significant.

(b) In mathematics (see Table 2), means are statistically different in three of the six grades. In grades one, four and five, students in effective schools do significantly better than students in control schools. In grades two, three and six the differences between the means are not significant.

(c) In language arts (see Table 3), means are statistically different in four of the six grades. In three grades, i.e., one, two and five, students in effective schools do significantly better than students in control schools. In grade three, students in control schools do significantly better than students in effective schools. In grades four and six the differences between the means are not significant.

TABLE 1

Reading Comprehension

Summary Data on ITBS Grade Equivalent Scores for Students Attending Effective and Control Schools

Grade Type of Mean	Effective Schools	Control Schools	National Norm
Grade 1			
Unadjusted Mean	2.10	1.88	1.86
Adjusted Mean 1	2.09 *	1.89	
Grade 2			
Unadjusted Mean	2.77	2.51	2.90
Adjusted Mean 1	2.68	2.62	
Grade 3			
Unadjusted Mean	3.30	3.53	3.87
Adjusted Mean 1	3.31	3.52 *	
Grade 4			
Unadjusted Mean	4.33	4.41	4.87
Adjusted Mean 1	4.38	4.38	
Grade 5			
Unadjusted Mean	5.25	5.25	5.86
Adjusted Mean 1	5.28	5.21	
Grade 6			
Unadjusted Mean	6.02	6.24	6.80
Adjusted Mean 1	6.04	6.21	

* 95% probability that differences between students attending effective or control schools were real rather than chance differences.

1 The adjusted posttest means represent a scientific estimate as to how the two groups of students would have performed on the posttest assuming that they had identical pretest means.

TABLE 2

Mathematics

Summary Data on ITBS Grade Equivalent Scores for Students Attending Effective and Control Schools

Grade Type of Mean	Effective Schools	Control Schools	National Norm
Grade 1			
Unadjusted Mean	1.81	1.69	1.85
Adjusted Mean 1	1.80 *	1.69	
Grade 2			
Unadjusted Mean	2.69	2.64	2.86
Adjusted Mean 1	2.63	2.72	
Grade 3			
Unadjusted Mean	3.51	3.62	3.85
Adjusted Mean 1	3.52	3.61	
Grade 4			
Unadjusted Mean	4.88	4.77	4.84
Adjusted Mean 1	4.90 *	4.76	
Grade 5			
Unadjusted Mean	5.78	5.68	5.85
Adjusted Mean 1	5.78 *	5.69	
Grade 6			
Unadjusted Mean	6.52	6.63	6.81
Adjusted Mean 1	6.56	6.59	

* 95% probability that differences between students attending effective or control schools were real rather than chance differences.

1 The adjusted posttest means represent a scientific estimate as to how the two groups of students would have performed on the posttest assuming that they had identical pretest means.

TABLE 3

Language Arts

Summary Data on ITBS Grade Equivalent Scores for Students Attending Effective and Control Schools

Grade Type of Mean	Effective Schools	Control Schools	National Norm
Grade 1			
Unadjusted Mean	2.43	2.03	2.04
Adjusted Mean 1	2.43 *	2.04	
Grade 2			
Unadjusted Mean	3.15	2.76	3.00
Adjusted Mean 1	3.06 *	2.87	
Grade 3			
Unadjusted Mean	4.04	4.21	3.97
Adjusted Mean 1	3.98	4.27 *	
Grade 4			
Unadjusted Mean	4.98	5.17	4.93
Adjusted Mean 1	5.07	5.08	
Grade 5			
Unadjusted Mean	6.16	5.96	5.88
Adjusted Mean 1	6.23 *	5.87	
Grade 6			
Unadjusted Mean	6.86	6.95	6.85
Adjusted Mean 1	6.90	6.89	

* 95% probability that differences between students attending effective or control schools were real rather than chance differences.

1 The adjusted posttest means represent a scientific estimate as to how the two groups of students would have performed on the posttest assuming that they had identical pretest means.

In summary, nine of the eighteen comparisons (50%) of ITBS mean grade equivalent scores are significant at the .05 level or beyond. Of these, seven (78%) favor the effective schools (grade one in reading, grades one, four and five in mathematics, and grades one, two and five in language arts), while two (22%) favor the control schools (reading and language arts in grade three). Thus, while we did not find significant differences in achievement in all subject areas at each grade level, we can conclude that the effective schools project is assisting schools make significant gains in student achievement.

D. Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses to a Questionnaire Entitled "Describing Your School's Characteristics" (DYSC)

A second key question concerning the impact of membership in the effective schools project is: Do staff in project schools view their schools differently than staff in control schools? This is an important question because a key aspect of the effective schools program argues that certain characteristics of schools (e.g., high staff expectations, productive use of time, and cooperation and collegiality) pre-stage gains in student achievement.

To measure staff perceptions about their school a questionnaire (Describing Your School's Characteristics: DYSC) was administered in January 1985 to teachers, instructional assistants and principals in both project and control schools (see Appendix C for a copy of the instruments). This questionnaire was constructed by the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL) based on the effective schools and school change literatures. It asks respondents to assess to what degree nine components of effective schools (as generated from the literature) are in place in their own schools.

Table 4 contains the responses of teachers, instructional assistants and principals in both project and control schools. In interpreting these data the developers of the questionnaire caution that they are perceptions, which may be different from what actually happens in schools on a day-to-day basis. The scores in each of the nine components range from -14 (when the response checked to seven questions, each scored as -2, is "never true": see the questionnaire in Appendix C) to +14 (when the response checked to seven questions, each scored as +2, is "always true"). A mean score is then calculated for all respondents in each of the nine components. The questionnaire developers suggest that a mean score in the +7 to +14 range is prefered: scores in this range signify that a component is perceived by respondents to be between "usually" and "always" operational in the building.

Examination of the data in Table 4 reveals several interesting patterns:

(a) Teachers in effective schools (column 1) are most positive about their school (a mean score of 8.0), followed by principals (column 3, a mean score of 7.7), followed by instructional assistants (column 2, a mean score of 6.2). These scores do not indicate a great difference in perception, i.e., less than two points separates all three groups.

Of greater interest are the differences among the school personnel across the individual components. Teachers, for example, only rate one component, i.e., component 8, below a score of seven. Principals rate two components, i.e., 4 and 5, below a score of seven. Instructional assistants rate five components, i.e., 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, below a score of seven. These scores, while not negative, indicate the areas where respondents perceive improvements could be made.

(b) Teachers in control schools (column 4) are most positive about their school (a mean score of 8.0), followed by principals (column 6, a mean score of 7.1), followed by instructional assistants (column 5, a mean score of 6.1). Again, these scores do not indicate a great difference in perception: all three means are less than two points apart.

Again, there are differences in perception about the individual components. Teachers rate one component, i.e., Component 8, below a score of seven. Instructional assistants rate four components, i.e., 2, 4, 5 and 8, below a score of seven.

TABLE 4

Summary of Data from the Questionnaire Entitled
"Describing Your School's Characteristics"

DYSC Component	Means for Project Schools' Personnel			Means for Control Schools' Personnel		
	Teachers (N=93) (1)	Instructional Assistants (N=7) (2)	Principals (N=6) (3)	Teachers (N=101) (4)	Instructional Assistants (N=7) (5)	Principals (N=5) (6)
1. Diagnosis and Prescribing Instruction	9*	9	9	10	7	9
2. Expectations	10	7	8	9	5	7
3. Effective Instruction	9	4	7	9	7	6
4. Use of Time	7	5	6	8	2	6
5. Knowledge of Outcomes	7	5	6	7	5	6
6. Rewards and Praise	7	6	9	7	8	8
7. Building and Faculty Management	9	5	8	9	7	9
8. Cooperation and Collegiality	5	7	8	5	5	6
9. Parental Involvement	9	8	8	8	9	7
Mean	8.0	6.2	7.7	8.0	6.1	7.1

* Scores are means calculated from a possible range of -14 to +14. Scores between +7 and +14 indicate that respondents perceive a component to be between "usually" and "always" operational in the school.

Principals rate four components, i.e., 3, 4, 5 and 8, below a score of seven.

(c) Both the pattern of mean responses within effective and control schools and the size of the means are very similar. In effective and control schools teachers have the most positive perceptions, followed by principals and instructional assistants in that order. Also, the mean score for teachers in both effective and control schools is 8.0, principals 7.7 and 7.1 respectively, and for instructional assistants 6.2 and 6.1 respectively.

While these data are useful in identifying components where school improvement efforts might profitably be directed, i.e., components scored below seven, they also suggest that school personnel in both effective and control schools have very similar perceptions about their schools. In short, these data suggest that teachers, instructional assistants and principals in effective schools do not see the characteristics of their school as significantly different than their peers in control schools. This is an interesting finding because the expectation was that effective schools would be perceived as different (on these nine components) from control schools.

E. Teacher, Instructional Assistant (IA) and Principal Perceptions About the Project

Questionnaires were sent to all teachers (April, 1985), IA,'s and principals (May, 1985) in the six project schools. Following several attempts to maximize returns, the response rates were 69, 100 and 100 percent for teachers, IA's and principals, respectively.[2] Questions focused on eight areas: (1) the concept of effective schools, (2) knowledge of the project, (3) organizational change, (4) staff development, (5) instructional practices, (6) instructional improvement, (7) effectiveness of the project, and (8) the effectiveness in teaching basic skills. Each area will be analyzed separately.

---

[2] One IA declined to respond because they were not assigned to the school until the second semester of the school year.

1. The Concept of Effective Schools

Examination of the data in Table 5 indicates that the vast majority of teachers, IA's and principals believe that the project will improve their school and that they understand the six project components (see questions 1 and 2, respectively). For example, only 5 and 4 percent of teachers disagree with questions 1 and 2, respectively. There seems to be less agreement concerning whether parents know about the project (see question 3). While 67 percent of the principals and 57 percent of the IA's agree with question 3, only 24 percent of the teachers respond so positively. Fully 53 percent of the teachers respond "no opinion" to question 3. Another 23 percent disagree with question 3. Parent involvement would seem to be an area for discussion during the 1985-86 school year.

While a large majority of teachers, IA's and principals indicate they are excited about being in the project, teachers appear the least enthusiastic (see questions 4, and 5c). Forty-two percent of the teachers, for example, agree or offer no opinion to the question "I am not excited about being in the effective schools project" (question 4). By contrast, the vast majority of project personnel rate each other as being excited to be in the project (see questions 4a, 5, 5a and 5b).

2. Knowledge of the Effective Schools Project

Teachers, IA's and principals were asked a number of questions about knowledge of and commitment to the effective schools project. They were asked to use a five point scale, one being the highest value, in responding to four questions (Table 6). Each group rates teachers a little above average for knowledge of the research about effective schools: means of 2.5, 2.7 and 2.7 for teachers, IA's and principals, respectively (question 1). Interestingly,

TABLE 5

Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses
to Questions About the Effective Schools Concept

Questionnaire Item		Teachers (N=92)	Instructional Assistants (N=7)	Principals (N=6)
1. The Effective Schools Project can help us become a better school.	Agree	87%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	8%	---	---
	Disagree	5%	---	---
2. I understand the six components of the Effective Schools Project.	Agree	92%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	4%	---	---
	Disagree	4%	---	---
3. Parents understand we are in the Effective Schools Project.	Agree	24%	57%	67%
	No Opinion	53%	29%	---
	Disagree	23%	14%	34%
4. I am not excited about being in the Effective Schools Project.	Agree	28%		
	No Opinion	14%		
	Disagree	58%		
4a. My teachers are not excited about being in the Effective Schools Project.	Agree		---	17%
	No Opinion		---	---
	Disagree		100%	84%
5. The principal is excited about being in the Effective Schools Project.	Agree	73%		
	No Opinion	23%		
	Disagree	3%		
5a. The IA(s) is excited about being in the Effective Schools Project.	Agree	66%		
	No Opinion	28%		
	Disagree	5%		
5b. My Principal/Instructional Assistant is excited about being in the Effective Schools Project.	Agree		100%	84%
	No Opinion		---	17%
	Disagree		---	---
5c. I am excited about being in the Effective Schools Project.	Agree		100%	100%
	No Opinion		---	---
	Disagree		---	---

TABLE 6

Teacher, Instructional Assistant, and Principal Responses
to Questions About Knowledge of the Effective Schools Project

Questionnaire Item	Teachers (N=93)	Instructional Assistants (N=7)	Principals (N=6)
1. How knowledgeable is your faculty about the research on Effective Schools?	2.3*	2.7	2.7
2. How knowledgeable are you about the research on Effective Schools?	2.5	1.9	2.0
3. How committed is your faculty to becoming a more Effective School?	2.3	2.0	2.0
4. How committed are you to becoming a more Effective School?	1.7	1.3	1.2

* Scores are means on a scale of one to five with one being the highest value.

while teachers rate themselves only as knowledgeable as their peers, i.e., 2.5 versus 2.5, both IA's and principals consider themselves more knowledgeable than teachers (compare teacher, IA and principal responses questions 1 and 2).

Each group has similar views concerning the commitment of faculty to becoming more effective: means of 2.3, 2.0 and 2.0 for teachers, IA's and principals, respectively (question 3). But IA's and principals consider themselves slightly more commited as individuals than do teachers (compare the mean scores in questions 3 and 4). While the three means for commitment are high, these data suggest that attention should be given to building faculty knowledge of the research and support for the project.

3. Organizational Change

Teachers, IA's and principals are in agreement that being in the project will have positive impact on the school (Table 7). With very few exceptions, each group agrees that important changes have occurred in the school this year (question 1) and that similar changes should occur next year (question 2). While 62, 100 and 84 percent of teachers, IA's and principals, respectively, feel that teachers have had increasing input into the site plan as a consequence of being a project school, only 19 percent of the teachers disagree (questions 3 and 3a). This strong feeling of involvement is further supported by the fact that fully 81 the percent of teachers disagree with the statement "I don't feel a part of the effective schools project" (question 4). Moreover, only 13 percent of teachers agree with this statement. Finally, while the majority of teachers, i.e., 59 percent, do not see communication as a problem in their school, a third do (question 5). Communication seems to be an area for discussion during the 1985-86 school year.

TABLE 7

Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses
to Questions About Organizational Change

Questionnaire Item		Teachers (N=93)	Instructional Assistants (N=7)	Principals (N=6)
1. Being in the Effective Schools Project has brought important changes to our school this year.	Agree	73%	86%	84%
	No Opinion	17%	14%	17%
	Disagree	10%	---	---
2. I expect being in the Effective Schools Project will bring important changes to our school next year.	Agree	79%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	15%	---	---
	Disagree	5%	---	---
3. I feel I had more input into the school site plan this year because we were in the Effective Schools Project.	Agree	62%		
	No Opinion	19%		
	Disagree	19%		
3a. I feel teachers have more input into the school site plan this year because we were in the Effective Schools Project.	Agree		100%	84%
	No Opinion		---	17%
	Disagree		---	---
4. I don't feel a part of the Effective Schools Project.	Agree	13%		
	No Opinion	6%		
	Disagree	81%		
5. Communication is not a problem in our school.	Agree	59%		
	No Opinion	8%		
	Disagree	33%		

4. Staff Development

The data in Table 8 indicate that teachers, instructional assistants and principals are almost unanimous in agreeing that "teachers regularly talk about ways to improve teaching, discipline and school climate" (question 1), and that both grade level meetings and full faculty meetings have addressed issues concerning implementing the six components of the project (questions 2 and 3). A similar pattern of responses is found to the statement "Wednesday staff development sessions have focused on school improvement" (question 4).

A somewhat different pattern of responses emerges from question 5. While 59 percent of the teachers agree that "the February retreat was helpful in shaping the 1985-86 site plan", fully 34 percent offer "no opinion". Only 7 percent, however, disagree with the statement. By contrast, with the exception of one principal, instructional assistants and principals are unanimous in their support of the February retreat. Teacher responses to the final question about staff development are interesting because they suggest that the majority of teachers perceive they have received sufficient training for school improvement (question 6). While 37 percent agree "I want more staff development on school improvement", fully 49 percent disagree. A further 14 percent offer no opinion.

5. Instructional Practices

Examination of the responses concerning instructional practices reveals some areas of disagreement among teachers, instructional assistants and principals (see Table 9). There is certainly no disagreement about the inclusion of the six project components in the 1985-86 site plan, or whether the plan includes ways to improve teaching, discipline and school climate. Teachers, instructional assistants and principals are almost unanimous in responding positvely to statements 1 and 2.

TABLE 8

Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses
to Questions About Staff Development

Questionnaire Item		Teachers (N=93)	Instructional Assistants (N=7)	Principals (N=6)
1. Teachers regularly talk about ways to improve teaching, discipline and school climate.	Agree	79%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	12%	---	---
	Disagree	9%	---	---
2. We have talked about how to implement the Effective Schools components (e.g., curriculum alignment and instruction) in grade level meetings.	Agree	92%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	4%	---	---
	Disagree	3%	---	---
3. We have talk about how to implement the Effective Schools components (e.g., curriculum alignment and instruction) in faculty meetings.	Agree	99%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	---	---	---
	Disagree	1%	---	---
4. Wednesday staff development sessions have focused on school improvement.	Agree	82%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	10%	---	---
	Disagree	7%	---	---
5. The February Retreat was helpful in shaping the 1985-86 Site Plan.	Agree	59%	100%	84%
	No Opinion	34%	---	---
	Disagree	7%	---	17%
6. I want more staff development on school improvement.	Agree	37%		
	No Opinion	14%		
	Disagree	49%		

TABLE 9

Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal
Responses to Questions About Instructional Practices

Questionnaire Item (Response Group)		Teachers (N=93)	Instructional Assistants (N=7)	Principals (N=6)
1. The six Effective Schools components are included in our site plan for 1985-86.	Agree	95%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	5	---	---
	Disagree	---	---	---
2. The ways to improve teaching, discipline and school climate are written into our school plan.	Agree	91%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	7%	---	---
	Disagree	2%	---	---
3. I like the new math program, i.e., MMP or TAI (Paxon and Troost excluded)	Agree	28%	67%	75%
	No Opinion	47%	17%	25%
	Disagree	25%	17%	---
4. Teachers are committed to teaching the new math program, i.e., MMP or TAI (Paxon and Troost excluded)	Agree	33%	34%	75%
	No Opinion	54%	33%	25%
	Disagree	8%	33%	---
5. The IA has visited my classroom on more than one occasion and offered suggestions for improving instruction.	Agree	72%		
	No Opinion	---		
	Disagree	28%		
6. The principal has visited my classroom on more than one occasion and offered suggestions for improving instruction.	Agree	85%		
	No Opinion	2%		
	Disagree	13%		
7. I get sufficient time to plan for instruction.	Agree	11%		
	No Opinion	2%		
	Disagree	87%		
7a. Teachers get sufficient time to plan for instruction.	Agree		---	---
	No Opinion		---	---
	Disagree		100%	100%
8. The Principal is a good instructional leader.	Agree	80%		
	No Opinion	8%		
	Disagree	12%		
8a. I think I am capable of providing leadership to make our school more effective.	Agree		100%	100%
	No Opinion		---	---
	Disagree		---	---

Disagreement surfaces over the Missouri Math (MMP) and Team Assisted Instruction (TAI).[3] A majority of instructional assistants and principals agree "I like the new math program, i.e., MMP or TAI", while 67 and 75 percent agree with the statement, respectively, only 28 percent of the teachers agree they like the program (question 3). Twenty-five percent of the teachers indicate they didn't like the new math program, while fully 47 percent responded "no opinion". Similar differences in perception surface in the responses to the statement "Teachers are committed to the new math program, i.e., MMP or TAI (question 4). Here, with a single exception, principals agree with the statement, while instructional assistants are split about evenly among the three response options, i.e., 34, 33 and 33 percent respond "agree", "no opinion" and "disagree", respectively. A third of the teachers agree with the statement about commitment to the new programs, while fully 54 percent offer "no opinion". Interestingly, only 8 percent disagree. Clearly, mathematics instruction is an issue for discussion during the 1985-86 school year.

The vast majority of teachers indicate that IA's visit their classrooms to improve instruction, i.e., 72 percent of teachers agree with question 5, and indicate that their principals do likewise, i.e., 85 percent agree with question 6. On the issue of receiving sufficient time to plan for instruction (questions 7 and 7a), teachers, instructional assistants and principals are almost unanimous in their perception that teachers get insufficient time to plan. Only 11 percent of the teachers agree with the statement "I get sufficient time to plan for instruction" (question 7).

Finally, turning to the issue of instructional leadership, a large proportion of teachers perceive their principal as a good leader, i.e., 80

---

[3] Teachers, IA's and principals at Faxon and Troost did not respond to questions 3 and 4 because they did not use either the MMP or TAI programs.

percent of the teachers agree with question 8, while both instructional assistants and principals are unanimous in agreeing with the statement "I think I am capable of providing leadership to make our school more effective" (question 8a).

6. Instructional Improvement

Table 10 contains the responses of teachers, instructional assistants and principals to questions concerning instructional improvement in their schools. Examination of the responses to questions 1 and 1a indicate that the vast majority of teachers, instructional assistants and principals understand how data on Academic Learning Time (ALT) can improve classroom performance, i.e., 65, 86 and 100 percent of teachers, IA's and principals agree with the statements. Only 6 percent of the teachers disagree with statement 1. However, while all the instructional assistants and principals agree that "All teachers should be trained to code/observe ALT in each others' classroom" (question 2), less than half (42 percent) of the teachers agree with the statement. Almost as many teachers (35 percent) offer "no opinion", while another 23 percent disagree. It is possible here that while many teachers see the value of the ALT data for instructional improvement, they remain to be convinced that they personally need to collect it.

We find a similar pattern of responses to questions concerning the Teacher Expectation Student Achievement (TESA) activity. Again, the overwhelming majority of teachers, instructional assistants and principals understand how TESA training can improve classroom performance, i.e., 80, 86 and 100 percent of teachers, instructional assistants and principals agree with the question 3 or 3a. Whereas, fewer teachers (63 percent) agree that all teachers should collect TESA data (question 4). Here, almost a third of the teachers (29 percent) disagree with question 4. As we found before, instructional

TABLE 10

Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses
to Questions About Instructional Improvement

Questionnaire Item		Teachers (N=93)	Instructional Assistants (N=7)	Principals (N=6)
1. I understand how getting data on Academic Learning Time (ALT) can help me become a better teacher.	Agree	65%		
	No Opinion	29%		
	Disagree	6%		
1a. I understand how getting Academic Learning Time (ALT) can help my faculty become better classroom teachers.	Agree		86%	100%
	No Opinion		14%	---
	Disagree		---	---
2. All teachers should be trained to code/observe ALT in each others' classroom.	Agree	42%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	35%	---	---
	Disagree	23%	---	---
3. I understand how Teacher Expectations Student Achievement (TESA) training can help me become a better teacher.	Agree	80%		
	No Opinion	8%		
	Disagree	12%		
3a. I understand how Teacher Expectations Student Achievement (TESA) training can improve the classroom performance of my teachers.	Agree		86%	100%
	No Opinion		---	---
	Disagree		14%	---
4. All teachers should be trained in TESA and code/observe in each others' classrooms.	Agree	63%	100%	83%
	No Opinion	9%	---	17%
	Disagree	29%	---	---
5. Having a Summer Retreat to talk about school improvement activities for the 1985-86 site plan is a good idea.	Agree	58%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	9%	---	---
	Disagree	33%	---	---
6. Having concentrated staff development activities in the summer, (e.g., three days on TESA, or curriculum alignment, or math instruction) is a good idea.	Agree	47%	67%	100%
	No Opinion	12%	17%	---
	Disagree	42%	17%	---

assistants and principals are almost unanimous in agreeing that all teachers should collect the data.

On the issue of summer training there appears to be some differences of opinion among project personnel. For example, while instructional assistants and principals are unanimous in agreeing that "Having a summer retreat to talk about school improvement activities for the 1985-86 site plan is a good idea", a little more than half (58 percent) of the teachers agree (question 5). Moreover, a third (33 percent) of the teachers disagree with the value of a summer retreat. We find a similar pattern of responses to the statement that "Having concentrated staff development activities in the summer ... is a good idea" (question 6). Here, fewer teachers agree with the statement, i.e., 47 percent, while almost as many, i.e., 42 percent, disagree. Instructional assistants and principals, by contrast, are overwhelmingly supportive, i.e., 67 and 100 percent agree with question 6, respectively. It would seem that how best to deliver staff development for instructional improvement is an issue for discussion during the 1985-86 school year.

7. Effectiveness of the Project

Table 11 contains responses to questions concerning the effectiveness of the project. Teachers, instructional assistants and principals are very nearly unanimous in agreeing that their "school can become more effective by emphasizing the effective school components", i.e., 84, 100 and 100 percent agree with question 1, respectively. Only three percent of the teachers disagree with question 1. There is a similarly strong perception that "Gathering data about our school (e.g., DYSC) is helpful in planning improvements", i.e., 76, 86 and 84 percent of teachers, instructional assistants and principals, respectively, agree with question 2. Again, only 3 percent of teachers disagree with question 2.

TABLE 11

Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Responses
to Questions About the Effectiveness of the Project

Questionnaire Item		Teachers (N=93)	Instructional Assistants (N=7)	Principals (N=6)
1. I think our school can become more effective by emphasizing the Effective Schools components.	Agree	84%	100%	100%
	No Opinion	13%	---	---
	Disagree	3%	---	---
2. Gathering data about our school (e.g., DYSC) is helpful in planning improvements.	Agree	76%	86%	84%
	No Opinion	20%	14%	---
	Disagree	3%	---	17%
3. Teachers work well as a team in this school.	Agree	77%	100%	83%
	No Opinion	11%	---	---
	Disagree	13%	---	17%
4. Given a choice, I would withdraw our school from the Effective Schools Project.	Agree	10%	---	---
	No Opinion	18%	---	---
	Disagree	72%	100%	100%
5. Being in the Effective Schools Project has not changed much about the way we do things in this school.	Agree	23%		
	No Opinion	19%		
	Disagree	58%		
6. The Principal is very capable of providing leadership to make our school more effective.	Agree	84%		
	No Opinion	4%		
	Disagree	10%		

Teachers are seen to work well as a team by all school personnel. Responses to question 3 indicate that 77, 100 and 84 percent of teachers, instructional assistants, and principals, respectively, agree that "Teachers work well as a team in this school". Only a very small proportion of teachers (13 percent) and one principal disagree with question 3.

When asked if given a choice they would drop their school from the project, 72, 100 and 100 percent of teachers, instructional assistants and principals responded "no" (question 4). Only 10 percent of the teachers indicated they would withdraw their school; an additional 18 percent offered "no opinion".

Finally, 58 percent of teachers disagree with the statement "Being in the effective school project has not changed much about the way we do things in this school": an additional 23 percent agree (question 5). Fully 84 percent agree that "the principal is capable of providing leadership to make our school more effective " (question 6). This suggests that the vast majority of teachers are confident that their principal can lead school change in their building.

8. Effectiveness in Teaching Basic Skills

Teachers, instructional assistants and principals were asked to rate how effective their school was in teaching the basic skills and their level of satisfaction with this effectiveness (Table 12). They were asked to use a five point rating scale, one being the highest value, in responding to two questions.

The mean scores for teachers, instructional assistants and principals to the question "How effective is your school in teaching the basic skills in reading and mathematics?" are very similar, i.e., 2.0, 2.1 and 2.3, respectively (question 1). While these scores are above the average score of 3.0, they suggest that each group perceives there is some room for improvement.

TABLE 12

Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal
Responses to Questions About the Effectiveness of Their School
in Teaching Basic Skills

Questionnaire Item	Teachers (N=93)	Instructional Assistants (N=7)	Principals (N=6)
1. How effective is your school in teaching the basic skills in reading and math?	2.0*	2.1	2.3
2. How satisfied are you with this level of effectiveness?	2.6	2.6	3.0

* Scores are means on a scale of one to five with one being the highest value.

The mean scores to the question "How satisfied are you with this level of effectiveness" shows a similar pattern, i.e., 2.6, 2.6 and 3.0 for teachers, instructional assistants and principals, respectively. Again, while these scores are above the average score of 3, they suggest that each group is far from completely satisfied with the present level of effectiveness.

F. Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Views About Improving the Project

Teachers, IA's and principals were asked to respond to open-ended questions concerning (a) the staff development needed by teachers in the project, and (b) what needs to happen to improve their schools. They were also invited to make any other appropriate comments. Responses to these several questions are presented below.

1. Staff development needed by project teachers

Teachers in the project schools noted the following areas as important staff development topics (the figures in parentheses are the number of teachers recording that topic):

1. Behavior modification/discipline/classroom management (12)
2. Strategies to teach mathematics (8)
3. Strategies to teach reading (8)
4. Communication/staff interpersonal relations (7)
5. Strategies for student motivation (4)
6. Effective use of planning time (4)
7. Strategies for involving parents (4)
8. Curriculim alignment (3)
9. Ways to help special education students (3)
10. Stress (3)
11. Strategies to teach science and health (3)
12. Strategies to teach social studies (3)
13. Academic Learning Time (ALT) (2)
14. Strategies to teach fine arts (2)
15. Record keeping/reporting mechanisms (2)
16. How to use Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) (1)
17. Leadership skills (1)
18. Effective Schools components (1)

19. Teacher Expectations Student Achievement (TESA) (1)
20. Strategies to teach writing
21. Test taking skills

It is interesting to note that the majority of these areas are instructionally related. This indicates a real concern on the part of teachers to improve their classroom performance (see Appendix D for a full listing of comments). These responses also suggest that the majority of teachers are disinterested in engaging in staff development in several of the project components (e.g., leadership, expectations, climate and parent involvement).

Instructional Assistants listed the following areas as staff development needs for their teachers:

1. Curriculum alignment (6)
2. Strategies for math instruction (3)
3. Classroom management (2)
4. Academic Learning Time (ALT) (2)
5. Teacher Expectations Student Achievement (TESA) (1)
6. Team building (1)
7. Strategies for reading instruction (1)
8. Test taking strategies (1)
9. Test data analysis (1)

This list is very similar to that generated by teachers (see Appendix D for a full listing of comments). IA's agree with teachers that improving instruction is the critical staff development need.

Finally, principals indicated the areas in which they thought teachers needed staff development:

1. Classroom management (2)
2. Teacher Expectations Student Achievement (TESA) (2)
3. Strategies for teaching reading, math, science and social studies (2)
4. Teamwork/interpersonal relations (1)
5. Academic Learning Time (ALT) (1)
6. Student motivation (1)

Again, this list is very similar to those of the teachers and IA's (see Appendix D for a full listing of comments).

2. Ways to improve the project

Analysis of teacher responses to two open-ended questions, i.e., "What things need to happen in your building to make it a better school?" and "Any additional comment?" generates ten areas where improvements are needed (see Appendix E for a full listing of comments):

1. More planning time is needed. Teachers suggest replacing music, art and P.E. to give them regular planning time: teachers indicate they are unable to implement their site plans because of insufficient planning time.

2. Teachers indicate that more attention should be given to increasing staff commitment to the project and the school site plans: teachers suggest this commitment should extend to supportive and janitorial staff. A suggestion is made that principals should be more active in removing uncommitted staff.

3. Teachers indicate a need to improve communications at the departmental level (e.g., more regular grade-level meetings), as well as between IA, principal and teachers. The suggestion is made that some principals are not involving the faculty in decision-making and some IA's are playing "favorites" by withholding information and assistance from some teachers.

4. Improved discipline is a concern of teachers. The central issues are the need to develop uniform and consistent enforcement of rules, and the need to find an alternative to suspension.

5. Increasing parental involvement is seen as a critical need. The most frequently cited areas are discipline, homework and support to school activities.

6. Project schools are seen as in urgent need of repair. Teachers report leaking ceilings, peeling paint, lack of running water or bathrooms and other similar faults. The connection between bright, clean and safe conditions and a building climate that is both vital and exciting is cited. Teachers believe that a building in poor repair lowers expectations.

7. Teachers indicate that materials and supplies are frequently not available or are late in arriving once ordered. They want materials available to teach when school opens in the Fall.

8. Teachers want improved leadership at the building level. In particular, they want principals and IA's to be in the buildings and to be more vigilant in monitoring teacher behavior. There is a feeling that rules are not enforced unformly for all teachers.

9. Teachers suggest that attention should be given to increasing student motivation to succeed. This would include raising teachers' expectations of students, as well as working directly with students to raise their own visions and aspirations.

10. Teachers indicate a need to improve the quality of classroom instruction. They outline a number of differing strategies to address this need:

    (a) stop Chapter 1 pull-outs
    (b) eliminate combination rooms
    (c) remove special education students from regular rooms
    (d) reduce class size and provide more aides
    (e) revise retention policy to remove parent waiver

Instructional Assistants were asked the same two open-ended questions as teachers (see Appendix E for a full listing of comments):

1. Teachers need a greater commitment to effective instruction: this might involve changing their own style and raising their students' expectations for success.

2. Planning time for teachers needs to be increased.

3. More time should be provided to practice innovations (e.g., TESA), as well as to provide monitoring and feedback following practice.

4. Stronger leadership should be exercised at the building level. Pressure should be placed on teachers unwilling to commit to the project to leave the school.

5. Teachers need to spend time learning about the six components of the project: not all teachers are hearing the same message and getting the same assistance.

6. The level of parental involvement must be raised.

Finally, the six project principals were asked to respond to the same two open-ended questions as teachers and IA's (see Appendix H for a full listing of comments):

1. Teachers need more planning time for instruction.

2. Each school would be more efficient by increasing the number of specialized staff (e.g., teachers, aides, counselors, librarian, and instructional assistant).

3. Attention should be given to improving communication at the building level and developing better interpersonal relationships between staff.

4. Project schools are in urgent need of repair.

5. Attention should be given to improving the academic/social climate of the schools: teaming and collegiality are seen as important issues.

6. Reduce staff development sessions to two each month. Weekly sessions are too disruptive, provide too little time for practice.

7. Reduced class size is seen as a strategy to improve academic achievement: "slower" learners seen as requiring more individual attention.

8. Provide each project school a permanent substitute teacher: too frequently the building sub is assigned to another building. The suggestion is to keep them exempted from the regular sub pool.

9. Retain a budget line for teacher travel to other effective school projects: travel seen as both a reward and as a means to bring in fresh ideas.

G. Concluding Comments

Before detailing recommendations based on the synthesis of these data, it would be useful to summarize the major findings. First, a covariate analysis was conducted on the Spring 1985 ITBS reading, mathematics and language arts scores using the spring 1984 scores as the covariate. We found that nine of eighteen grade-level comparisons were statistically different. Seven of the significant differences favored the project schools, while only two favored the control schools.

Second, analysis of teacher, IA and principal responses to the perceptual instrument "Describing Your School's Characteristics" (DYSC) revealed some interesting patterns: the DYSC measures the degree to which school personnel perceive their school engaging in practices identified in the literature as defining an effective school.

The respective mean scores of teachers, IA's and principals in project and control schools were almost identical. In each case, teachers had the highest mean score, followed by principals and trailed by IA's. While there was some variation in the perceptions of teachers in project schools across the nine components of the DYSC, these data suggest that teachers in both project and control schools perceive little difference in the degree to which their schools model the characteristics of effective schools.

Third, analysis of questionnaire data from teachers indicated that the majority of teachers (a) value and understand the project, and expect that it will continue to improve their school, (b) feel a part of the project, and perceive they have a greater involvement in decision making because they are a project school, (c) support the staff development activities, (d) question the implementation of the math intervention, (e) see the building leadership as effective, and (f) want the project to continue into the 1985-86 school year. They also indicate a number of areas where improvements are needed to make the project more effective.

Fourth, questionnaire data from IA's and principals revealed similar high levels of support for the project. The majority of building leaders (a) see the project as important for school improvement and understand the six project components, (b) see all three groups in their school as excited about being in the project, (c) rate teachers and building leaders somewhat differently in their knowledge of and commitment to the project, (d) support the staff development provided to shape the school improvement plan, (e) support the mathematics interventions, (f) see site-base data as important for school improvement, (g) see themselves as able to provide leadership for school improvement, and (h) want the project to continue into the 1985-86 school

year. IA's and principals also indicate a number of areas where improvements are needed to make the project more effective.

By synthesizing these data a number of factors emerge that require attention during Phase III of the project. Areas for improvement are described below:

1. The project needs a full time coordinator. During Phase II, the Director of Curriculum, Instruction and Special Projects coordinated the project through the first semester. The Coordinator of Special Projects assumed those duties for the second semester. It is clear that coordinating the project cannot be done through a part-time assignment: the project requires close day-to-day monitoring.

2. The governance structure of the project should be revised to include principals on the steering committee.

3. The coordinator of the project, together with the steering committee should articulate a management plan for the year. This plan should be explained to all staff in the project schools within three weeks of the opening of the school year. This is an important activity for both practical and symbolic reasons. It will signal to all staff (a) that the project has a management plan, and (b) what the lines of authority and decision making are for Phase III of the project.

4. The project must give more attention to facilitating change at the building level. Observations during Phase II suggest that the principal and IA cannot give sufficient daily attention to activities which bring about change at the building level. Teachers indicated that teachers in some schools were not committed to the idea of improvement by using the activities proposed in the project. They also suggested that these teachers were not being monitored by the IA or principals. Yet we know that failure to monitor the implementation of activities detailed in the site plans, for example, reduces the likelihood of change at the building level. Without additional support in the building, implementation issues will receive little attention compared with instructional and management issues.

5. The project should design a staff development program for leadership development to involve both principals and IA's. This activity was included during Phase I of the project but was not included during Phase II: it became evident during Phase II that leadership remained a concern for both building leaders and teachers.

The focus of staff development during Phase II was on teachers (e.g., curriculum alignment in reading and TESA). Nothing formal was presented for principals and IA's. Leadership development (e.g., facilitating change, monitoring implementation, creating a collaborative environment) should become a major focus for Phase III of the project.

6. Activities planned for project schools and designed by the project leadership should be laid out within three weeks of the opening of the school year. Such a practice will permit coordination of the activities across the year, as well as allow the schools to plan ahead.

   Some interventions during Phase II were too fragmented and mounted without sufficient lead time in some schools (e.g., TESA, curriculum alignment in reading, mathematics intervention). The problem for the project schools was that they were asked to do more (both in terms of staff development and additional field tests) without (a) additional time to plan for it or practice it, and (b) any additional incentives or rewards for engaging in the extra work. The result was that some teachers were unable to give their best effort and sound interventions were not implemented as designed.

   For Phase III, project leaders should do the following:

   (a) design project activities for the entire year prior to the 1985-86 school year and disseminate this plan within three weeks of the opening of school

   (b) the plan for project activities should be sensitive to competing demands on teachers and building leaders, and ensure that the expectations for change in teacher behaviors are realistic

   (c) design a mechanism for providing teachers with time to learn about, plan for and evaluate school improvement activities

   (d) design a reward system for teachers and building leaders that recognizes both effort and commitment to school improvement activities

7. The staff development provided for project teachers should focus more systematically on those activities suggested by the six components of the project and detailed in the individual school site plans.

   The project coordinator and facilitators (see number four above) should work with the building leadership to plan the staff development activities for the school year. This planning should identify the areas where staff development is

needed, and develop both the content and method of delivering that staff development. For example, reading and mathematics achievement is uneven across grades in the majority of project schools. This suggests that a topic for staff development is examination of effective ways to improve reading and mathematics instruction. Similarly, we found in the analysis of DYSC data that project schools indicate a problem with collegiality. This key topic should become a priority for staff development in Phase III of the project.

The point to be made is that the staff development activities need to be closely related to the substance of the site plan and organized in such a way that they are useful rather than only symbolic. The coordinator of the project should work with each school to facilitate their plan for staff development.

8. The project coordinator, together with the steering committee should work to create a climate that indicates that the project schools are both important and different. If project schools are treated no differently than non-project schools, it is difficult for teachers and building leaders to see how they can achieve anything special or different. Thus, the project coordinator and steering committee should work quickly to eliminate problems identified by project staff. Three areas are especially critical:

   (a) teachers and building leaders indicate that teaching materials, i.e., books and other teaching aides, are frequently not available, or if ordered arrive too late in the year to be helpful

   (b) teachers and building leaders have similar comments about supplies. A strong case is made that even when the schools comply with district requests, supplies frequently are delayed or never arrive

   (c) teachers and building leaders point to examples of decaying buildings and poor maintenance that go unrepaired or attended. They argue that such depressing physical conditions undercut their efforts to create strong building climates and raise student expectations for success. Moreover, they argue that poorly repaired buildings dampens their conviction that their own school can be regarded as an effective school

   The project coordinator and steering committee should move quickly to remediate these problems for project schools.

9. The project should give attention to getting greater parent involvement in the activities of project schools during Phase III. A plan to solicit greater involvement should focus on (a) ways to inform parents about the project, (b) ways to involve

parents in supporting the learning and disciplinary goals of the school (e.g., requiring that homework be completed), and (c) ways to expand the attendance of parents in school activities (e.g., school advisory councils and open house).

Without such involvement by parents the effectiveness of the schools to improve will be limited. Greater emphasis should be placed on designing activities to involve parents in meaningful ways in the education of their children.

APPENDIX A

Profile of Project Schools, 1983-85

Profile of Project Schools, 1983-85

School	Type	Enrollment 1983-84/1984-85	Percent Minority 1983-84/1984-85	Number of Teachers 1983-84/1984-85	Percent Minority Teachers 1983-84/1984-85	Percent Receiving Free Lunch 1983-84/1984-85	Average Attendance 1983-84/1984-85	Percent Belonging 165+ Days 1983-84/1984-85	Intervention Rooms 1984-1985
Bancroft	K-6	513/482	96.3/97.1	18.5/26.0	65.0/48.0	78.6/69.2	92.3/92.8	75.2/79.0	2 PAR Gr. 1 [a] 1 PAR Gr. 2 1 PAR Gr. 4 1 Int. Gr. 3 1 Int. Gr. 5
Faxon	K-6	371/332	97.6/97.3	15.5/17	58.0/59.7	87.8/74.7	93.4/94.8	83.7/84.9	1 PAR Gr. 2 1 Int. Gr. 3
Holmes	K-6	338/386	97.0/94.6	17.0/20.0	53.0/60.0	56.6/65.6	95.2/94.0	79.2/84.5	1 Int. Gr. 3 1 PAR Gr. 4 1 PAR Gr. 6
Pershing	K-6	459/424	98.5/98.4	18.0/22.0	64.0/59.0	57.9/61.3	94.4/93.9	86.9/93.9	1 PAR Gr. 4 1 Int. Gr. 5
Troost	K-6	479/488	95.0/96.7	19.5/26.0	64.0/54.5	57.9/48.4	94.6/93.5	87.5/97.9	1 PAR Gr. 1 1 PAR Gr. 2 1 PAR Gr. 4 2 Int. Gr. 3,5
Woodland	K, 5-6	700/689	56.4/58.6	35.0/36.0	74.0/65.6	57.9/61.0	90.5/90.2	86.8/89.3	3 PAR Gr. 6 3 Int. Gr. 5

[a] Pilot Alternative Room (PAR) in grades 1,2,4 and 6: double staffed rooms for Chapter I eligible students. Intervention Rooms (Int.) in grades 3 and 5: double staffed rooms for retained and low achieving students.

APPENDIX B

Covariance Summaries for Reading, Mathematics and Language Arts Spring 1985 ITBS Scores by Grade Level

TABLE A

Analysis of Covariance Summaries for
Reading Comprehension by Grade Level for
Students Attending Effective and Control Schools

Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	F Value	Probability
Grade 1				
Program	1	4.31	8.36	.00*
Covariate: 1984 Reading Test Scores	1	9.05	17.55	.00*
Error	450	.52		
Grade 2				
Program	1	.31	.66	.42
Covariate: 1984 Reading Test Scores	1	144.60	314.56	.00*
Error	430	.48		
Grade 3				
Program	1	5.03	9.97	.00*
Covariate: 1984 Reading Test Scores	1	296.70	587.87	.00*
Error	455	.51		
Grade 4				
Program	1	.00	.00	1.0
Covariate: 1984 Reading Test Scores	1	322.96	400.64	.00*
Error	541	.80		
Grade 5				
Program	1	.87	1.16	.28
Covariate: 1984 Reading Test Scores	1	627.23	835.02	.00*
Error	752	.75		
Grade 6				
Program	1	5.05	3.56	.06
Covariate: 1984 Reading Test Scores	1	738.83	520.33	.00*
Error	764	1.42		

* Significant at .05 level or better

TABLE B

Analysis of Covariance Summaries for
Mathematics by Grade Level for
Students Attending Effective and Control Schools

Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	F Value	Probability
Grade 1				
Program	1	1.45	4.42	.04*
Covariate: 1984 Math Test Scores	1	2.15	6.58	.01*
Error	428	.33		
Grade 2				
Program	1	.80	2.67	.10
Covariate: 1984 Math Test Scores	1	69.42	230.86	.00*
Error	430	.30		
Grade 3				
Program	1	.87	2.32	.13
Covariate: 1984 Math Test Scores	1	146.00	392.15	.00*
Error	453	.37		
Grade 4				
Program	1	2.65	7.32	.01*
Covariate: 1984 Math Test Scores	1	226.59	626.42	.00*
Error	536	.36		
Grade 5				
Program	1	1.60	4.0	.05*
Covariate: 1984 Math Test Scores	1	420.90	1052.21	.00*
Error	748	.40		
Grade 6				
Program	1	.16	.33	.57
Covariate: 1984 Math Test Scores	1	532.10	1116.12	.00*
Error	761	.48		

* Significant at .05 level or better

TABLE C

Analysis of Covariance Summaries for
Language Arts by Grade Level for
Students Attending Effective and Control Schools

Source of Variation	df	Mean Square	F Value	Probability
Grade 1				
Program	1	15.31	19.19	.00*
Covariate: 1984 Language Arts Test Scores	1	3.57	4.48	.04*
Error	419	.80		
Grade 2				
Program	1	3.65	6.34	.01*
Covariate: 1984 Language Arts Test Scores	1	204.42	354.43	.00*
Error	409	.58		
Grade 3				
Program	1	8.71	11.18	.00*
Covariate: 1984 Language Arts Test Scores	1	284.31	365.10	.00*
Error	431	.78		
Grade 4				
Program	1	.01	.02	.89
Covariate: 1984 Language Arts Test Scores	1	433.52	620.16	.00*
Error	536	.70		
Grade 5				
Program	1	4.48	35.24	.00*
Covariate: 1984 Language Arts Test Scores	1	845.09	1216.47	.00*
Error	749	.70		
Grade 6				
Program	1	.02	.03	.87
Covariate: 1984 Language Arts Test Scores	1	962.93	1226.57	.00*
Error	763	.79		

* Significant at .05 level or better

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire Entitled "Describing Your School's Characteristics" (DYSC)

ESCRIBING YOUR SCHOOL'S CHARACTERISTICS
TEACHER'S VERSION

School _____ District _____

e _____

re with _____ Administrators _____ Teachers _____ Other (Specify)

am a training team member _____ Yes _____ No

PLEASE MARK WITH A #2 PENCIL

A = ALWAYS TRUE
U = USUALLY TRUE
S = SELDOM TRUE
N = NEVER TRUE
D = DON'T KNOW

his is a characteristic of my school or classroom"

1. I use an assessment or monitoring procedure to identify students who will require additional time, unusual learning activities or instruction on prerequisite skills for any particular learning objective.	A	U	S	N	D
2. During oral question periods, I phrase questions at different difficulty levels so all students can be successful.	A	U	S	N	D
3. Parents are included in activities for improving school effectiveness.	A	U	S	N	D
4. The principal encourages teachers to work together to improve instruction by providing time for this to occur and rewarding teachers who do.	A	U	S	N	D
5. All of my students are engaged for a minimum of 80% of the instructional period.	A	U	S	N	D
6. I consistently explain to students, or display in the classroom, the objectives which are guiding instruction.	A	U	S	N	D
7. I cooperatively develop with other teachers learning activities or instructional units for specific topics.	A	U	S	N	D
8. Staff members are regularly praised/rewarded/recognized for their instructional improvement efforts.	A	U	S	N	D
9. I spend time with students who want to discuss personal concerns and problems.	A	U	S	N	D
10. When students misbehave, I make it clear it is the students' behaviors and not the students themselves that are unacceptable.	A	U	S	N	D
11. The principal has established a policy for providing easy access to student academic records to help me diagnose student needs.	A	U	S	N	D
12. At least twice a year, I inform parents of their child's educational progress by describing specific academic skills and concepts where the child is successful or unsuccessful.	A	U	S	N	D
13. The staff uses agreed upon instructional objectives for each grade level and subject area to guide instruction building-wide.	A	U	S	N	D
14. At this school there is an annual process for deciding in which areas of the curriculum students are successful and which areas need improvement.	A	U	S	N	D
15. I give academic assignments on which anyone can be successful, regardless of his or her reading ability.	A	U	S	N	D
16. During oral recitation and large group instruction, I use techniques which require all members of the class to be actively involved.	A	U	S	N	D
17. I provide students with a classroom behavior code which is perceived as fair, reliable, and based on clear rules.	A	U	S	N	D
18. I monitor the percent of time my students are actively engaged with assigned tasks.	A	U	S	N	D
19. It is safe for students or staff to go anywhere in or around this building.	A	U	S	N	D
20. I address all students by name.	A	U	S	N	D
21. I help students understand and correct errors on homework and quizzes.	A	U	S	N	D
22. Report card grades are based upon well-defined criteria, many and frequent assessment points and are related to mastery of the objectives.	A	U	S	N	D
23. I frequently use the results of tests keyed to my teaching objectives to determine progress toward students' mastery of those objectives.	A	U	S	N	D
24. During instructional time, students are engaged in tasks on which they can perform with a high degree of success.	A	U	S	N	D
25. I emphasize students' successes and potential rather than their shortcomings and failures.	A	U	S	N	D
26. I vary instructional techniques so that all students can learn what is taught.	A	U	S	N	D
27. Sufficient time is provided for planning and preparation for instruction so classroom time is not used for these activities.	A	U	S	N	D
28. All test data are analyzed by race, gender, social class and ethnicity to insure that all students are learning.	A	U	S	N	D
29. I use the results of the standardized achievement tests, including subtests, to determine how well students have learned the skills measured by the test.	A	U	S	N	D
30. When I praise students, I do so immediately after the praised behavior occurs and mention that	A	U	S	N	D

31. I help parents become involved in their child's learning. For example, I explain to the parents what the instructional objectives are, what their role is in helping with homework, and how they can help their child improve his/her performance.	SA	A	S	N	D
32. I am encouraged to try out new instructional strategies without risk.	SA	A	S	N	D
33. I wait the same length of time to allow all students to answer oral questions.	SA	A	S	N	D
34. There are established procedures, such as a newsletter, a bulletin board or folder file in the teachers' work room, or regularly scheduled meetings, which I use to share ideas about instructional techniques and materials with other teachers.	SA	A	S	N	D
35. As a regular practice I visit other teachers' classrooms and they visit mine to observe instructional activities.	SA	A	S	N	D
36. Students of low and middle ability levels are assigned work on which they can get between 60-90% correct.	SA	A	S	N	D
37. The principal requires that teachers clearly define their instructional objectives.	SA	A	S	N	D
38. Activities which take time out of the school day, such as moving students from one place to another, taking attendance, reading announcements, are handled in efficient, non-disruptive ways.	SA	A	S	N	D
39. When students are engaged in seatwork, I move around the classroom monitoring the progress of each student.	SA	A	S	N	D
40. I give rewards, appropriate praise and recognition to all deserving students — including those that may not be at the top of their class but are successful at the tasks assigned to them.	SA	A	S	N	D
41. The principal recognizes academic achievement and sets up building-wide procedures for acknowledging such accomplishments throughout the school year.	SA	A	S	N	D
42. I give students continuous information about how well they are learning.	SA	A	S	N	D
43. Students' academic work is always publicly displayed or featured.	SA	A	S	N	D
44. This building is well cared for — the floors are cleaned, broken windows are replaced immediately and other maintenance of the school building is done regularly.	SA	A	S	N	D
45. Teachers are praised, rewarded and/or publicly recognized when they are successful in raising academic achievement.	SA	A	S	N	D
46. Teachers and other staff members support, respect, and generally care about each other.	SA	A	S	N	D
47. Discipline in the classroom is unobtrusive but occurs swiftly to deal with disruption when necessary.	SA	A	S	N	D
48. Parents are welcome at the school; I see them and talk with them.	SA	A	S	N	D
49. The principal sets high but realistic expectations for student academic achievement and constantly reminds the staff of those expectations.	SA	A	S	N	D
50. I enforce the school absenteeism and tardiness policy and consistently follow-up on any non-compliance.	SA	A	S	N	D
51. As a regular practice, I talk with other teachers about the academic work of students for whom we share responsibility.	SA	A	S	N	D
52. Low socioeconomic status and minority parents attend parent-teacher conferences to discuss their child's academic progress.	SA	A	S	N	D
53. When planning instruction, I refer to a sequence or specific set of skills or behaviors which students are expected to accomplish.	SA	A	S	N	D
54. I assign homework and other independent drill and practice activities that students can successfully complete without assistance.	SA	A	S	N	D
55. I plan management activities, such as distribution of materials, to maximize instructional time.	SA	A	S	N	D
56. I give students a list of specific criteria against which the students can judge the quality of their work.	SA	A	S	N	D
57. All students receive rewards, praise and appreciation for academic success.	SA	A	S	N	D
58. I assess student acquisition of all the skills necessary to master a task or objective.	SA	A	S	N	D
59. Parents visit my classrooms.	SA	A	S	N	D
60. Parents have alternatives for scheduling conferences with me about their child's progress in school.	SA	A	S	N	D
61. When an assignment is given, I explain exactly what a student must do to successfully complete it.	SA	A	S	N	D
62. I have minimum standards for each student which I expect that student to achieve.	SA	A	S	N	D
63. When designing an instructional unit, I designate which objectives are minimal and must be learned by everyone and which are optional.	SA	A	S	N	D

SCRIBING YOUR SCHOOL'S CHARACTERISTICS
ADMINISTRATOR'S VERSION

PLEASE MARK WITH A #2 PENCIL

A = ALWAYS TRUE
U = USUALLY TRUE
S = SELDOM TRUE
N = NEVER TRUE
D = DON'T KNOW

hool _____ District _____

te _____

e with ____ Administrators _____ Teachers _____ Other (Specify)

a training team member _____ Yes _____ No

s is a characteristic of my school or classroom"

1. Teachers use an assessment or monitoring procedure to identify students who will require additional time, unusual learning activities or instruction on prerequisite skills for any particular learning objective.	A	U	S	N	D
2. During oral question periods, teachers phrase questions at different difficulty levels so all students can be successful.	A	U	S	N	D
Parents are included in activities for improving school effectiveness.	A	U	S	N	D
4. The principal encourages teachers to work together to improve instruction by providing time for this to occur and rewarding teachers who do.	A	U	S	N	D
All students are engaged for a minimum of 80% of the instructional period.	A	U	S	N	D
6. Teachers consistently explain to students, or display in the classroom, the objectives which are guiding instruction.	A	U	S	N	D
Teachers cooperatively develop learning activities or instructional units for specific topics.	A	U	S	N	D
Staff members are regularly praised/rewarded/recognized for their instructional improvement efforts.	A	U	S	N	D
Teachers spend time with students who want to discuss personal concerns and problems.	A	U	S	N	D
When students misbehave, teachers make it clear it is the students' behaviors and not the students themselves that are unacceptable.	A	U	S	N	D
The principal has established a policy for providing easy access to student academic records to help teachers diagnose student needs.	A	U	S	N	D
12. At least twice a year, teachers inform parents of their child's educational progress by describing specific academic skills and concepts where the child is successful or unsuccessful.	A	U	S	N	D
The staff uses agreed upon instructional objectives for each grade level and subject area to guide instruction building-wide.	A	U	S	N	D
14. At this school there is an annual process for deciding in which areas of the curriculum students are successful and which areas need improvement.	A	U	S	N	D
Teachers give academic assignments on which anyone can be successful, regardless of their reading ability.	A	U	S	N	D
During oral recitation and large group instruction, teachers use techniques which require all members of the class to be actively involved.	A	U	S	N	D
17. Teachers provide students with a classroom behavior code which is perceived as fair, reliable, and based on clear rules.	A	U	S	N	D
Teachers monitor the percent of time their students are actively engaged with assigned tasks.	A	U	S	N	D
19. It is safe for students and staff to go anywhere in or around this building.	A	U	S	N	D
20. The teachers and principal address all students by name.	A	U	S	N	D
Teachers help students understand and correct errors on homework and quizzes.	A	U	S	N	D
22. Report card grades are based upon well-defined criteria, many and frequent assessment points and are related to mastery of the objectives.	A	U	S	N	D
Teachers frequently use the results of tests keyed to their teaching objectives to determine progress toward students' mastery of those objectives.	A	U	S	N	D
24. During instructional time, students are engaged in tasks on which they can perform with a high degree of success.	A	U	S	N	D
Teachers emphasize students' successes and potential rather than their shortcomings and failures.	A	U	S	N	D
26. Teachers vary instructional techniques so that all students can learn what is taught.	A	U	S	N	D
Sufficient time is provided for planning and preparation for instruction so classroom time is not used for these activities.	A	U	S	N	D
28. All test data are analyzed by race, gender, social class and ethnicity to insure that all students are learning.	A	U	S	N	D
Teachers use the results of the standardized achievement tests, including subtests, to determine how well students have learned the skills measured by the test.	A	U	S	N	D
30. When teachers praise students, they do so immediately after the praised behavior occurs and	A	U	S	N	D

1. Teachers help parents become involved in their child's learning. For example, they explain to the parents what the instructional objectives are, what their role is in helping with homework, and how they can help their child improve his/her performance.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
2. Staff members are encouraged to try out new instructional strategies without risk.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
3. Teachers wait the same length of time to allow all students to answer oral questions.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
4. There are established procedures, such as a newsletter, a bulletin board or folder file in the teachers' work room, or regularly scheduled meetings, which teachers use to share ideas about instructional techniques and materials with each other.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
5. As a regular practice teachers visit each other's classrooms to observe instructional activities.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
6. Students of low and middle ability levels are assigned work on which they can get between 80-90% correct.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
7. The principal requires that teachers clearly define their instructional objectives.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
8. Activities which take time out of the school day, such as moving students from one place to another, taking attendance, reading announcements are handled in efficient, non-disruptive ways.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
9. When students are engaged in seatwork, the teacher is moving around the classroom monitoring the progress of each student.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
10. Teachers give rewards, appropriate praise and recognition to all deserving students — including those that may not be at the top of their class but are successful at the tasks assigned to them.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
11. The principal recognizes academic achievement and sets up building-wide procedures for acknowledging such accomplishments throughout the school year.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
12. Teachers give students continuous information about how well they are learning.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
13. Students' academic work is always publicly displayed or featured.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
14. This building is well cared for — the floors are cleaned, broken windows are replaced immediately and other maintenance of the school building is done regularly.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
15. Teachers are praised, rewarded and/or publicly recognized when they are successful in raising academic achievement.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
16. Teachers and other staff members support, respect, and generally care about each other.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
17. Discipline in the classroom is unobtrusive but occurs swiftly to deal with disruption when necessary.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
18. Parents are welcome at the school; the teachers and principal see them and talk with them.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
19. The principal sets high but realistic expectations for student academic achievement and constantly reminds the staff of those expectations.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
20. All administrators and teachers enforce the school absenteeism and tardiness policy and consistently follow-up on any non-compliance.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
21. As a regular practice, teachers talk to each other about the academic work of students for whom they share responsibility.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
22. Low socioeconomic status and minority parents attend parent-teacher conferences to discuss their child's academic progress.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
23. When planning instruction, teachers refer to a sequence or specific set of skills or behaviors which students are expected to accomplish.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
24. Teachers assign homework and other independent drill and practice activities that students can successfully complete without assistance.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
25. Teachers plan management activities, such as distribution of materials, to maximize instructional time.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
26. The teachers give students a list of specific criteria against which the students can judge the quality of their work.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
27. All students receive rewards, praise and appreciation for academic success.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
28. Teachers assess student acquisition of all the skills necessary to master a task or objective.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
29. Parents visit their children's classrooms.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
30. Parents have alternatives for scheduling conferences with teachers about their child's progress in school.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
31. When an assignment is given, the teachers explain exactly what a student must do to successfully complete it.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
32. Teachers have minimum standards for each student which they expect that student to achieve.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐
33. When designing an instructional unit, teachers designate which objectives are minimal and must be learned by everyone and which are optional.	⊏A⊐	⊏U⊐	⊏S⊐	⊏N⊐	⊏O⊐

APPENDIX D

Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Comments Concerning Staff Development Needed by Project Teachers

---

* This Appendix contains a listing of all written comments on the questionnaire.

1. Teachers indicated they needed the following staff development:

.IMS
.Language Development Activities
.Planning time
.Planning time
.Reading - Alternative techniques for ESL - Bilingual students
.Math - Alternative method and materials for ESL students
.Creating positive attitudes and improvement of morals for teachers and students
.Stress - reduction for teachers and students
.Departmentalization in the elementary school, especially in Gr. 4-6
.Human Development and how it relates to education
.Stress - how to cope with
.How to be a team and a team member and do an effective job
.How to use AV materials and equipment effectively
.Classroom management
.Dealing with children with severe emotional problems
.Motivational techniques to use in the classroom
.Areas of reading and math concepts
.Special techniques in working with learning disabilities
.Ways to identify certain learning disabilities
.More information about teaching around eye alignment problems, memory, retention, and mental problems
.Management
.Record keeping
.Better ways of communication with downtown
.Pupil-teacher courtesy in the halls
.Curriculum alignment
.Missouri Math
.Assertive discipline
.Math-Word problems
.Techniques on discipline
.How to deal with children that have special problems
.Math - Missouri Math at all grade levels
.None
.In my opinion, staff development activities should only occur before the commencement of school in the fall; because the short day on Wednesdays is disruptive to student learning and parent scheduling.
."How to" - deal with strong-willed and stubborn, unmotivated children
.Computer instruction
.Behavior modification
.How to get parents involved
.Limit to four topics per year. Teachers paid to participate, and lead inservice
.Report cards - grade level achievement - Cum card - Grade card
.Alignment
.Academic Learning Time
.What are effective schools? Go component by component and show how it works, this way the staff would understand.
.Discipline
.Motivation of students
.Parent involvement
.Reading

.Special Education
.Math
.Stress
.TESA
.Classroom Management/Discipline
.New Reading Series relative to curriculum alignment
.Math (new series)
.Primary test-taking skills
.Drawing in parents to support our efforts
.None - most of the sessions we attend do nothing but create more busy work and record keeping for faculty and give the staff development office something to do.
.Discipline, especially assertive discipline
.Parental involvement strategies, with stress on specific plans
.Classroom management
.Reading comprehension
.Science and Health
.Creative Writing
.Reading Centers and Math
.Better interpersonal relations among staff as a whole
.To replace tenured teachers with non-tenured
.Assertive discipline
.More planning time in our room with 45 minutes a week for Art, Music, P.E. No longer day - Prefer to rest at end of day - do extra needed at home. Our teachers know how to teach most effectively. Get some board members and administrators (Downtown) off our backs - Morale is low enough as it is now - we are educators - not bond servants.
.English
.Science
.Social Studies
.Time for planning
.Less of a feeling that we are sitting in a college-level course
.Time to make games required as suggested for H/M reading
.Respect for each others' varied abilities
.Science
.Social Studies
.Fine Arts
.ALT
.Reading Skills Instruction
.Correlating teach obj. (reading and math) with ITBS objectives
.Leadership skills
.Critical thinking skills for children

2. Instructional Assistants indicated that project teachers needed the following staff development:

.Mathematics
.TESA
.Classroom management
.Curriculum alignment
.Team building
.Curriculum alignment
.Math instruction

.Collection and use of a resource area for math and reading
.Classroom management techniques
.Test-taking strategies
.Curriculum alignment in math and reading
.Test data (how to analyze)
.ALT
.Working with objectives
.Curriculum alignment
.Curriculum alignment
.Curriculum alignment
.Time on Task
.Preparation for classroom instruction

3. Principals indicated that project teachers need the following staff development:

.Reading comprehension
.Management of classroom strategies
.Team work
.Classroom management
.Stress awareness
.TESA
.Classroom management strategies
.Professional treatment (something to upgrade the level of professionalism)
.Whole group instruction using the basal reader
.Student motivation
.Science, Math and Social Studies
.Interpersonal relationships
.TESA
.ALT

APPENDIX E

Teacher, Instructional Assistant and Principal Comments Concerning Ways to Improve the Project

---

* This Appendix contains a listing of <u>all</u> written comments on the questionnaire.

1. Teachers indicate that the following needs to happen in their buildings to make it a better school:

.Better parent involvement in disciplinary procedures
.More planning time
.More planning time on an individual basis
.Form a working, effective Parent Group
.School repairs: Painting maintenance (budget for wax)
.Commitment increased by staff for new programs
.Supportive staff maintenance, nurse and cafeteria workers: everyone should become involved in Effective School
.Revise Report Card - especially English/Social Studies Primary Level.
.Parents should have less say about retention
.A Board that considers teachers and children as a major part of all plans
.Less paperwork and more time spent on classroom duties
.More time for planning would help a lot
.The physical condition of the structure should be improved - water in most classrooms when it rains.
.A good computer program with working parts
.More true parent involvement
.More discipline
.More parent involvement
.More students need to be motivated to try to do their best
.Increased parent interest and support
.A means to replace teachers who make a commitment to the project for convenience with little or no intent to implement the components
.Commitment to teaching/effective teaching
.Being able to see beyond the classroom walls
.Planning time - could make the rest possible
.Librarian full-time
.Higher student expectation
.Parents need to insist students do homework and not make excuses as to why it wasn't done.
.In-school suspension for discipline
.Better teacher-teacher communication, and teacher-principal
.More positive statements and less negative ones
.More teacher judgement on academics instead of being told what to do
.Better communication between teachers and principal
.More positive comments and actions from principal - less criticism
.Using teacher input professionally - teachers appear to be told what to do, never get credit for their abilities or professional training.
.Need parent involvement/support desperately - it's pitiful!!!
.In-school suspension
.More planning time
.The school board needs to treat us like professionals, not children.
.General "daily need" supplies delivered more quickly to our school when ordered
.More individual plan time
.Repair work more quickly - before little problems become BIG EXPENSIVE ONES
.No morning withdrawals for Chapter 1 - especially Primary Level!
.Give teachers more time for classroom preparations.
.Guaranteed, look-forward-to, and plan for planning time

.Back-up place - i.e., a time-out room to put students for a day, half-day, etc.
.Supply store for students to purchase pencils, paste, crayons
.There needs to be a better feeling of unity among the staff, which makes for better morale.
.The uncommitted, complaining teachers need to either become committed or asked to leave.
.The student-teacher ratio must be lowered to improve teaching - including third and fourth grade Intervention and PAR.
.If AAA status can be achieved, it would improve several situations; if not, additional aides would help.
.Fewer changes per week
.More planning time - and not planning time schedule to do more paperwork or staff development
.The teachers need to quit complaining and criticizing and go on with their job.
.Cooperation
.School-wide motivational plans for quiet and discipline in hall
.More time to work and plan in our classrooms
.More reading materials - books and magazines for our children
.I would like to have more time to be here at school to plan my lessons.
.A complete paint job throughout and fix the falling ceilings
.Fix the plumbing so that water comes out of all the drinking units instead of just one. Thirty children waiting to get a drink at one water pipe is a big waste of time on task.
.The establishment of intervention rooms
.Regular classroom teachers only had 2 reading groups and we could be much more effective.
.Delete TAI
.Classroom management
.Dealing with children with severe emotional problems
.Motivational techniques to use in the classroom
.Departmentalize grades 5-6
.Provide time for teachers for materials development and preparation
.Hold extra-curricular activities after school - NOT during instruction time
.Start Reading the first day of school
.Teaching materials need to be available in the teacher's hands (e.g., Teacher Guides, Skills Instruction Masters, etc.)
.School Climate -Improvement to base school structure, i.e., roof repair, paint job on the wall. Plumbing and Electrical unit - needs to be improved and repaired all over the building. Bathroom facilities need to be replaced with better fixtures. Auditorium repair all over.
.More time to accomplish projects
.Have study groups for science and social studies
.More time to do things that pertain to instructing children, and less time talking about what needs to be done
.Time to think through new approaches
.Creation of a self-contained bilingual room for Grades 5 and 6
.Make necessary building repairs and paint
.More supplies and teaching materials
.We need more restrooms! Having one set of restrooms for the whole school is ridiculous.

.Stronger code of discipline - if a child is disruptive in my class, I want him OUT until he is ready to cooperate and work. I feel my job is to teach - parents should be held more accountable for disciplining.
.More time for planning - individual and grade level
.Better communication between pupils and teacher re discipline in the school
.Improved working conditions
.Lower class size
.Severe behavior disorder children taken out of regular classrooms as soon as possible
.Constructive leadership
.Repairs so the building looks pleasant
.Pleasant atmosphere, created by leaders who are pleasant and respectful to the teachers
.Repairs, painting, draperies in auditorium
.Better communication between administration and staff
.Principal to have more active part in happenings in school and with staff
.I.A. to be less of an "administrator" and a "buddy" to select few
.Have reading materials available from the beginning of school in the fall.
.Improve physical facility (e.g., stop the raining in classroom and infestation of rats, roaches and maggots).
.Provide more planning time by making supportive sources longer
.Facilities need to improve
.Get computers
.More discipline on children
.Renovate the building. Put a new roof on building. Repaint inside of building (has not been painted since 1974).
.More individual planning time
.Then joint communication among grade levels or departments
.Then entire faculty development for communication and sharing during the regular school day 7 hours total, including lunch, DAILY!
.The appearance of this building is very, very poor. We have holes in the floor, and the walls need painting. It is raining in the rooms.
.More departmental meetings during school time
.More special services
.More free planning time
.More supplies
.Longer planning time - at least 1 hour each day
.One aide per classroom
.Our building should be rehabilitated
.More parent involvement
.Para-Professional for reenforcement of academics, playground, lunch duty
.More planning time during the regular school hours every day
.Have additional time for planning during school day, at least twice a week or oftener, in place of having to donate my time after or before school
.Consistent building-wide rules for behavior
.Leadership that WILL ENFORCE! the school site plan
.All teachers need to take school site plan seriously.
.Need good supply of additional reading materials (non-basal) for each grade level.
.Stronger leadership

.Staff relationship is very poor
.Stronger commitment to be a better school by staff members
.More cooperation among some teachers
.A principal who will supply STRONG leadership
.Staff cooperation in uniformly teaching dist. obj. and testing for mastery
.More committed teachers - teachers committed to effective teaching
.Teachers should have higher expectations for students, and communicate these expectations to students.
.More commitment out of teachers to become more effective in teaching
.Provide time for classroom visits to improve Academic Learning Time
.Continue to improve professional attitude among the staff

2. Instructional Assistants indicate that the following needs to happen in their building to make it a better school:

.Parent involvement
.Commitment for high expectations from all students
.More planning time for teachers
.More teacher aides
.Lower pupil-teacher ratio
.Time to implement the new techniques presented
.Gain commitment from all staff members to a school-based program.
.Encourage transfers of teachers who are not committed to the program.
.More planning time for teachers AND more Art, PE, and Music
.At least half of the staff development time should involve grade level planning.
.Students need more motivation to learn and feel that school is an important place to be.
.Closer monitoring and involvement of administration
.Many teachers do not know or understand the components of Effective Schools. We need total commitment to effective teaching from ALL staff members.
.We need more time to practice the processes and techniques that have been presented.
.Practice, give and receive feedback; practice some more. Each time we strive to improve upon what happened before.
.Establish guidelines for keeping administrators at the building site as a rule.
.Stronger leadership - more building site, school-based management of our program.
.More planning time for teachers
.Having a supportive team in each building for PE, Art and Music, which would allow more planning time for teachers
.We need staff members who are committed to the concept of Effective Schools and are willing to put in the time and energy required to be successful.

3. Principals indicate that the following needs to happen in their building to make it a better school:

.Coordination, planning and input from schools needs to be improved!
.Needed repairs

.Increased staff, aides, counselors
.Better climate
.Interpersonal relationships
.Librarian
.Counselor
.A budget for teacher travel
.Planning time for teachers
.Staff development twice monthly
.More planning time to facilitate instruction
.Reduce the pupil/teacher ratio
.More time to meet with staff for the purpose of implementing and monitoring plans
.Increased staff - one additional IA, one additional clerk, Instructional Aides,
and Counselor
.Interpersonal relationships/working together
.Commitment, total
.Team teaching

4. Teachers offered the following comments to the question "Any additional comments?":

.Stipends should be given for retreats or meetings held outside working hours.
.The district needs to improve planning time for teachers by hiring instructors to teach Art, Music and P.E. This would allow for planning time.
.Spring Parent Conferences should be held after ITBS scores are returned to buildings.
.Delete split grades in Effective Schools
.Special classroom or teacher needed for students considered "borderline" by Placement Team and consequently do not fit into any programs. When a child is referred, a teacher is usually saying "help" - follow-up by the specialists is how to help!
.I strongly feel that teachers should be represented on the "Steering Committee" for Effective Schools. Our input is needed, perhaps response from teachers would be better if they had a say in planning.
.I appreciate the time and money that has been spend on the Project. I hope we get the results needed. The meeting concerning our Site Plan was worthwhile.
.Concerned about reaching those children who are deemed "not serviceable" by Special Ed., left in the regular classroom, but the classroom teacher knows that the child can't learn in regular setting. We have so many children of this type, and no help for them.
.Get rid of combination groups
.TESA and other programs are great if teachers are given time to get ready for all the new ideas.
.New programs are great. Never time added with the programs. I feel like the child abuse we read/hear about on TV, etc. I feel TEACHER ABUSE! not by using a stick, objects, etc., but pressure tactics.
.A placement team whose hands are not tied. A system to help children who fall in the slow learner group. . A system that will meet the needs of children with problems, who do not test well. Children who are rejected because of heavy case loads (speech), etc.
.Provide services or suggestions for children working below level after referrals and testing. Additional personnel to aid heavy case loads (Ex.: speech).

.Keep up the super work. I feel very needed and important - I want this to work at our school - we are the BEST.
.This is my first opportunity to work in the K.C. School District. I like what I see! Change, for the benefit of the childrens' education, and an urgent plea to do this professionally.
Our I.A.'s and Principal are excellent leaders! They are truly professional and highly motivated.
.I'm committed and strongly involved in the Effective Schools Project. I hope the ideas, plans, etc., are going to be implemented over a period of time and not abandoned as such ideas have been in the past. We need to stick with a good project like this.
.It would make better sense to train/prepare teachers for new programs (Answer program) before school begins or before beginning second semester instead of six weeks before school is out. It's too late to add new things when we are trying to complete the year.
.Staff development (in or out of the building) needs to be more concise in explaining various topics. Sometimes, especially out of the building, the presenters talk too much and are not always clear about interpreting material to us.
.More time is needed to organize for the benefit of the student. Too much time is spent talking about how to be an Effective School. Teachers need more time to develop ways to make his or her classroom effective (i.e., prepare study guides for science and social studies units, or prepare lists of the vocabulary developed in the reading series that would be available to all teachers.
.There need to be some kind of activities in our school that would develop school pride and school spirit.
.Parking lot needs to be surfaced with tar or concrete.
.Delete TAI
.Delete TESA
.More time is needed for planning instructional programs and time given for implementation of programs
.Too much paperwork filling out surveys like this one!!!
.This has been a very good year for me. There are many things that could be improved. I am very much concerned about the higher pay scale for teachers and smaller class sizes.
.No staff development
.In this district we need some interested board members who really try to look at things from the teachers' viewpoint.
.Additional planning time during school
.I need more planning time, but during the school time.
.More planning time without extending the day
.We need additional time for supportive services, every day would be fine.
.The thousands of dollars that are used for retreats would serve a better purpose if it were used to employ teacher aides and purchase additional materials. A district-wide plan should be developed focusing on getting more parent participation.
.Effective Schools Project has potential - IF administered effectively and explained before implementation.
.Because of the disinclination of our Principal and IA (also secretary) to make the teachers feel respected, some aspects of the Effective Schools Project have been impossible to carry out.

.The choice of substitute teachers has been very poor. Some clasrooms have had 4 or 5 sub. teachers in a two month time. Our building sub. would have been a better choice to take long term classrooms.

5. Instructional Assistants offered the following comments to the question "Any additional comments?":

.Without increased planning time, teachers feel pressured and then turn off. IA's can only be effective and do their instructional job if principals are glued to their buildings.
.More parent involvement

6. Principals offered the following comments to the question "Any Additional Comments?":

.A permanent building substitute teacher
.Decrease the amount of paperwork
.Renovation of the building